



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/479,918	01/10/2000	Cory E. Klatt	4944.85635	3694
7590	12/15/2004		EXAMINER	
Banner & Witcoff Ltd 1001 G Street N W Washington, DC 20001-4597			COLBERT, ELLA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/479,918	KLATT ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ella Colbert	3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 are pending in this communication filed 09/30/04 as Response to Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,563,999) Yaksich et al, hereafter Yaksich in view of (US 6,330,542) Sevcik et al, hereafter Sevcik.

With respect to claim 1, Yaksich teaches, (1) monitoring the sales management system to detect a predefined sales event (col. 2, lines 4-67); (2) in response to detecting the predefined sales event in step (1), generating event data comprising information that describes the sales event (col. 1, 49-67, col. 2, lines 1-67). Yaksich did not teach, (3) in a print processing facility, receiving the event data, comparing the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generating a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data.

Sevcik discloses, (3) in a print processing facility, receiving the event data, comparing the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether

the printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generating a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data (col. 1, lines 11-22, col. 3, lines 42-65, col. 6, lines 28-67, and col. 7, lines 1-2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a print processing facility for receiving the event data, comparing the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generating a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data and to modify in Yaksich in view of Yaksich's manufacturing (printing) facility at a number of geographically remote locations and because such a modification would allow Yaksich to manage commercial printing and the inefficiencies that exist for both the buyers of commercial printing and the providers (see Sevcik - col. 1, lines 8-16).

With respect to claim 2, Yaksich did not teach, wherein step (3) comprises the step of automatically generating a procurement request that requires approval by a corporate employee; and further comprising the step of approving the procurement request before the printed product is produced.

Sevcik discloses, wherein step (3) comprises the step of automatically generating a procurement request that requires approval by a corporate employee; and further comprising the step of approving the procurement request before the printed product is produced (col. 5, lines 21-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the step of automatically

generating a procurement request that requires approval by a corporate employee; and further comprising the step of approving the procurement request before the printed product is produced and to modify in Yaksich because such a modification would allow Yaksich to understand the significance of receiving an immediate quote computed from various print providers, to consider the process involved, the transaction costs to the organization, and the steps that are apart of the process before the printed product is produced.

With respect to claim 3, Yaksich teaches, transmitting the procurement request to a procurement system located at a corporate facility (col. 8, lines 28-34, col. 9, line 1 to col. 11, line 39).

With respect to claim 4, Yaksich teaches, further comprising the step of transmitting the approval to the print processing facility which, in response thereto, produces the printed product (col. 39, lines 39-42).

With respect to claim 5, Yaksich teaches, wherein the print order comprises a print production request that is directly fulfilled by a print production system without further approvals (col. 40, lines 65-67 and col. 41, lines 1-17).

With respect to claim 6, Yaksich did not teach, further comprising the step of checking one or more print criteria that must be satisfied before the printed product is actually produced.

Sevcik discloses, further comprising the step of checking one or more print criteria that must be satisfied before the printed product is actually produced (col. 6, lines 27-67 and col. 7, lines 1-2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a step for checking one or more print criteria that must be satisfied before the printed product is actually produced and to modify in Yaksich because such a modification would allow Yaksich for the customer (buyer) to have the capability to look at several print options and types of variables prior to the printed product being produced.

With respect to claim 7, Yaksich did not teach, wherein the printed product comprises sales literature.

Sevcik discloses, the printed product comprises sales literature (col. 7, lines 3-12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the printed product comprise sales literature and to modify in Yaksich because such a modification would allow Yaksich to have what is known as marketing collateral which includes sales and data sheets and brochures (sales literature).

With respect to claim 8, Yaksich and Sevcik did not teach, wherein the printed product comprises an award for a sales employee, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the printed product to comprise an award for a sales employee and to modify in Yaksich and Sevcik because such a modification would allow Yaksich and Sevcik to have a different design option and for the user to have the capability to print the specifications of the design (see col. 8, lines 59-64 –Sevcik).

With respect to claim 9, Yaksich did not teach, further comprising the step of transmitting over the Internet the event data to the print processing facility.

Sevcik discloses, the step of transmitting over the Internet the event data to the print processing facility (col. 3, lines 21-41). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit over the Internet the event data to the print processing facility and to modify in Yaksich because such a modification would allow Yaksich to have an automated Internet system that features a series of graphical interfaces which represent various printed products that are linked to a database of prices and other variable option from various print providers and to have the optimal equipment for the project to be computed and for the project to be produced on the most efficient equipment for that particular product.

With respect to claim 10, Yaksich did not teach, further comprising the step of retrieving corporate specific information in addition to the event data and using the corporate-specific information to generate a print production request. Sevcik discloses, retrieving corporate specific information in addition to the event data and using the corporate-specific information to generate a print production request (col. 3, lines 41-67 and col. 4, lines 1-4). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to retrieve corporate specific information in addition to the event data and use the corporate-specific information to generate a print production request and to modify in Yaksich because such a modification would allow Yaksich to have a system that has a complex database of information for custom products which allows for search and retrieval of specific information and automatically generates quotes for custom products and ensures the project is produced on the equipment for that particular product

With respect to claim 11, Yaksich and Sevcik did not teach, wherein the corporate-specific information comprises a corporate logo that is not stored in the corporate database, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have corporate-specific information comprises a corporate logo that is not stored in the corporate database and to modify in Yaksich and Sevcik because such a modification would allow Yaksich and Sevcik to have the information that is entered to become part of the database for that item (the item could be a corporate logo).

With respect to claim 12, Yaksich did not teach, wherein step (3) comprises the step of generating a print production request to produce the printed product without any human intervention at the corporate facility and without any human intervention at the print production facility. Sevcik discloses, generating a print production request to produce the printed product without any human intervention at the corporate facility and without any human intervention at the print production facility (col. 9, lines 26-64). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate a print production request to produce the printed product without any human intervention at the corporate facility and without any human intervention at the print production facility and to modify in Yaksich because such a modification would allow Yaksich to have a system have a home page that includes all of the information that a print buyer needs in order to send a print production job over the Internet from a corporate facility to a print production facility.

With respect to claim 13, Yaksich teaches, further comprising the step of translating at least some of the event data into a common print production request based on a schema mapping between fields in the corporate database and fields stored in the print processing facility (col. 11, lines 30-39 and col. 13, line 1 to col. 16, line 55).

With respect to claim 14, Yaksich teaches, (4) monitoring a second corporate sales management system to a second predefined sales event different from the predefined sales event of step (1) (col. 5, lines 30-46); (5) in response to detecting the second predefined sales event in step (4), generating second event data comprising information that describes the second predefined sales event (col. 6, lines 58-67 and col. 7, lines 1-9); and (6) in the print processing facility, receiving the second event data, comparing the second event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generating a second print order for the printed product using information extracted from the second event data (col. 7, lines 10-64).

With respect to claim 15, Yaksich teaches, wherein the predefined sales event comprises adding a new client to a client list (fig. 16-customer ID and Job ID#) (customer list with new client added at the bottom of the list).

With respect to claim 16, Yaksich teaches, further comprising the step of creating the one or more event rules by specifying parameters on a computer screen (col. 12, lines 20-34 and col. 14, lines 50-57).

With respect to claim 17, Yaksich teaches, a computer-implemented database monitor located at a corporate facility, wherein the database monitor detects changes to

the corporate sales management system and, in response thereto, generates event data comprising information that describes the sales management event (col. 5, lines 30-61). Yaksich did not teach, a print processing facility, located at a geographic location different from the corporate location and coupled to the database monitor over a network, wherein the print processing facility receives the event data, compares the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generates a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data. Sevcik discloses, a print processing facility, located at a geographic location different from the corporate location and coupled to the database monitor over a network, wherein the print processing facility receives the event data, compares the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generates a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data (col. 1, lines 11-22, col. 3, lines 42-65, col. 6, lines 28-67, and col. 7, lines 1-2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a print processing facility, located at a geographic location different from the corporate location and coupled to the database monitor over a network, wherein the print processing facility receives the event data, compares the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether the printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generates a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the

event data and to modify in Yaksich in view of Yaksich's manufacturing (printing) facility at a number of geographically remote locations and because such a modification would allow Yaksich to manage commercial printing and the inefficiencies that exist for both the buyers of commercial printing and the providers (see Sevcik - col. 1, lines 8-16).

This claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 1.

With respect to claim 18, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 2.

With respect to claim 19, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claims 3 and 4.

With respect to 20, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 4.

With respect to 21, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 5.

With respect to claim 22, Yaksich teaches, wherein the print order comprises one or more print criteria that must be satisfied before the printed product is actually produced (col. 9 and 10, lines 25-67 and col. 11, lines 1-15).

With respect to claim 23, Yaksich and Sevcik did not teach, wherein the print processing facility notifies a corporate employee via e-mail of the print order, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the print processing facility notify a corporate employee via e-mail of the print order and to modify in Yaksich and Sevcik because such a modification would allow Yaksich and Sevcik to have the capability to have the delivery service send the

image to the client for approval and the client can contact the system by electronic mail to confirm approval of the order (notification of the print order to the client (employee) via e-mail).

With respect to claim 24, Yaksich and Sevcik did not teach, wherein the corporate employee is specified in one of the predefined event rules, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the corporate employee specified in one of the predefined event rules and to modify in Yaksich and Sevcik because such a modification would allow Yaksich and Sevcik to have a confirmation from the client (corporate employee) as to the approval to execute the order in full according to the description in the client's order (predefined event rules).

With respect to claim 25, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 9.

With respect to claim 26, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 10.

With respect to claim 27, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 11.

With respect to claim 28, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 12.

With respect to claim 29, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 13.

With respect to claim 30, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 7.

With respect to claim 31, Yaksich teaches, a print processing facility coupled to a plurality of corporate locations each comprising a sales management system, wherein the print processing facility receives from each of the plurality of corporate locations event data describing a predefined sales, compares the event data to one or more predefined event rules that determine whether a printed product should be produced and, in response to a positive determination, automatically generates a print order for the printed product using information extracted from the event data (col. 1, lines 49-67, col. 2, lines 1-67, and col. 3, lines 1-29).

This independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 1.

With respect to claim 32, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 15.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-32 are silent.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure.

Salgado (US 5,579,447) disclosed a total estimated time to print a job.

Arledge, Jr. et al (US 6,535,294) disclosed printing products over a communications network.

Elias et al (US 5,844,971) disclosed from creating and ordering.

Cai (US 5,995,985) disclosed an interface for printing data.

Grottfreid (US 6,076,076) disclosed a prepaid print card system.

Geller et al (US 5,844,554) disclosed a user providing new data via a user control.

Garfinkle et al (US 6,133,985) disclosed prints produced from digital images.

Inquiries

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



E. Colbert
December 9, 2004